



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1136/bmj.h5643](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h5643)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Majeed, A., & Molokhia, M. (2015). Identifying people with diabetes at high risk of blindness and amputation: A new risk tool will help to personalise care and advice and to target resources at those in greatest need. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 351, [h5643]. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h5643>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



EDITORIALS

Identifying people with diabetes at high risk of blindness and amputation

A new risk tool will help to personalise care and advice and to target resources at those in greatest need

Azeem Majeed *professor of primary care*¹, Mariam Molokhia *clinical reader in epidemiology and primary care*²

¹Department of Primary Care and Public Health, Imperial College London, London W6 8RP, UK; ²Department of Primary Care and Public Health Sciences, King's College London, London SE1 3QD, UK

Blindness and lower limb amputations are among the most feared complications of diabetes. Despite the frequency of these complications and their effect on patients, methods of identifying those patients with diabetes who are at greatest risk of blindness and amputation have been lacking. This gap has now been filled in a study by Julia Hippisley-Cox and Carol Coupland (doi:10.1136/bmj.h5441), using data from QResearch, a large clinical database derived from the electronic patient records used by general practices in the United Kingdom.¹

The study used data derived from electronic patient records of around 455 000 people with diabetes from 763 general practices in England. The same data source (QResearch) and statistical methods used in this study have also been used to produce other risk measurement tools—for example, QRISK, which has now been adopted by the NHS in England for measuring the risk of developing cardiovascular disease.² The data from primary care records were linked to other data sources such as NHS Hospital Episode Statistics. The authors then used Cox proportional hazards models to derive separate risk equations for the 10 year risk of blindness and amputation.

The equations were subsequently validated using data from two different sets of general practices (from QResearch and the Clinical Practice Research Datalink). In this validation, the two risk prediction models performed well, explaining around 41% and 32% of the variation in time to amputation and blindness, respectively, with good discrimination as measured by C statistic values. In the final phase of their work, the authors developed a web based calculator so that clinicians can enter their patients' data, and patients can enter their own data, to determine the 10 year risk of these complications.³

The authors are to be congratulated on the scale of their study and its potential impact on clinical practice and on self management. Previous risk prediction studies in diabetes have been on a substantially smaller scale. For example, the UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) was based on a sample

of around 5100 patients.⁴ Very few patients in the UKPDS developed blindness (n=116) or amputation (n=45) during follow-up, making derivation of accurate methods of predicting these complications difficult. Data on ethnicity were also lacking. In contrast, in the QResearch study, 4822 people had lower limb amputations and 8063 cases of blindness occurred during the follow-up period, and data on ethnicity were available. The risk factors in the final models—such as age, ethnicity, blood pressure, deprivation, glycosylated haemoglobin, and smoking for the amputation risk model—are what we might expect on the basis of previous research on complications of diabetes, but it is very useful to have the effect of each of these risk factors quantified.

The scale of the morbidity from diabetes and its impact on patients, clinicians, health systems, and societies is considerable and growing because of the continuing increase in the global prevalence of diabetes. Diabetic eye disease is now the second most common cause of blindness in people of working age in the United Kingdom and one of the most common causes of blindness worldwide.^{5 6} A previous study using NHS Hospital Episode Statistics showed increasing rates of diabetes related amputations in England, driven largely by the rising prevalence of type 2 diabetes.⁷ More than 7000 diabetes related amputations take place annually in England, which illustrates the impact of this complication on both patients and health systems.⁸

The new risk prediction models can help to provide the basis of a more individualised and holistic method of tackling these complications in patients. People with diabetes can for the first time be given individualised risk scores based on their own characteristics. They can also be shown how changes in their lifestyle or management affect their risk—for example, stopping smoking or improving their diabetes control—thus promoting more patient centred care for people with diabetes.⁹ For the NHS, the risk prediction models will permit risk stratification of people with diabetes, thus allowing resources to be targeted

at those groups of people at the highest risk of complications. This targeted use of resources is critically important in a period when the NHS faces unprecedented financial pressures.¹⁰

Some caveats remain, however. Firstly, we need to test the models in actual practice to see if they can improve the management of people with diabetes and thereby lead to lower rates of blindness and amputation. Secondly, because of the global burden of diabetes, we also need to test the impact of the models outside the United Kingdom, particularly in those countries with the highest prevalence of diabetes.¹¹

The risk prediction tools developed from QResearch are one example of the value of the data held by the NHS in its electronic medical records and administrative databases. These data have great potential to improve NHS clinical care as well as giving patients information to help them to make better decisions about their own health. We do, however, need to overcome the political, organisational, and technical barriers to making greater use of these data so that the NHS, clinicians, the public, and patients can all benefit fully from this potential.¹²

Imperial College London and King's College London are grateful for support from the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre scheme and the NIHR Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care scheme.

Competing interests: We have read and understood the BMJ policy on declaration of interests and declare the following interests: none.

Provenance and peer review: Commissioned; not externally peer reviewed.

- 1 Hippiusley-Cox J, Coupland C. Development and validation of risk prediction equations to estimate future risk of blindness and lower limb amputation in patients with diabetes: cohort study. *BMJ* 2015;351:h5441.
- 2 Hippiusley-Cox J, Coupland C, Vinogradova Y, et al. Predicting cardiovascular risk in England and Wales: prospective derivation and validation of QRISK2. *BMJ* 2008;336:1475-82.
- 3 ClinRisk. Welcome to the QDiabetes® (amputation and blindness)-2015 risk calculator. qdiabetes.org/amputation-blindness/index.php.
- 4 UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). *Lancet* 1998;352:837-53.
- 5 Liew G, Michaelides M, Bunce C. A comparison of the causes of blindness certifications in England and Wales in working age adults (16 to 64 years), 1999 to 2000 with 2009 to 2010. *BMJ Open* 2014;4:e004015.
- 6 The Eye Diseases Prevalence Research Group. Causes and prevalence of visual impairment among adults in the United States. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2004;122:477-85.
- 7 Vámos EP, Bottle A, Edmonds ME, Valabhji J, Majeed A, Millett C. Changes in the incidence of lower extremity amputations in individuals with and without diabetes in England between 2004 and 2008. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:2592-7.
- 8 Diabetes UK. More than 135 diabetes amputations every week. 2015. www.diabetes.org.uk/About_us/News/More-than-135-diabetes-amputations-every-week/.
- 9 Meltzer D, Egleston B. How patients with diabetes perceive their risk for major complications. *Eff Clin Pract* 2000;3:7-15.
- 10 Ham C. The three crises facing the NHS in England. *BMJ* 2015;351:h5495.
- 11 Majeed A, El-Sayed AA, Khoja T, Alshamsan R, Millett C, Rawaf S. Diabetes in the Middle-East and North Africa: an update. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2014;103:218-2.
- 12 Majeed A. Sources, uses, strengths and limitations of data collected in primary care in England. *Health Stat Q* 2004;(21):5-14.

Cite this as: *BMJ* 2015;351:h5643

© BMJ Publishing Group Ltd 2015